DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 403 CS 007 702

AUTHOR Bennett, Susan G.
TITLE Do Junior High School Reading/Language Arts Teachers Use Oral Language to Improve Reading Comprehension? A Study of Two Teachers.
PUB DATE 12 Apr 84
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English Spring Conference (3rd, Columbus, OH, April 12-14, 1984).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Junior High Schools; *Language Skills; *Listening Skills; *Oral Language; *Reading Comprehension; *Reading Research; Teacher Improvement; *Teaching Methods; Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Theory Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

To determine what recent research indicates about similarities and differences between reading and listening and current classroom practices in listening at the junior high level, and to discover whether teachers consciously and systematically provide a bridge between informal oral language and formal text language, a study was completed by conducting a literature review and by interviewing two classroom teachers with questions based on observation of their classes. Results of the interviews reinforced the overall findings of research: proportionally little oral language instruction took place in the classrooms, and teachers used teacher guides to materials primarily as sources for vocabulary instruction. The following are among suggestions based on the findings: (1) educators need to be convinced of students' need for instruction in written language and listening opportunities at all levels, (2) classrooms need reorganization to encourage authentic discussions, and (3) teacher training needs overhauling to include emphasis on the importance of oral language. (CRH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED246403

# Do Junior High School Reading/Language Arts Teachers Use Oral Language To Improve Reading Comprehension? A Study of Two Teachers

Susan G. Bennett, Ph.D.
University of Texas, Austin
Department of Curriculum
& Instruction
EDB 406
Austin, TX 78712

Presented at the NCTE Conference - April 12, 1984, Columbus, Ohio, Secondary Section.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Susan G. Bennett
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."



CS 007 702

Do Junior High School Reading/Language Arts

Teachers Use Oral Language To Improve Reading Comprehension?

A Study of Two Teachers

## Introduction

> Unless a child is offering an answer to a question asked by a teacher, he or she is not to speak aloud outside the lunchroom. Most students listen to little other than instructions and reprimands....
> (from M. Schmidt - student teacher after 10 weeks of daily observation in a public junior high school, Spring 1983)

Among speaking/writing/reading/listening, speaking and writing have been traditionally viewed as active modes of language with reading and listening as passive modes of language. Communication models talk about senders, message, and receivers and most of us can visualize a teapot with reading and listening pouring in and speaking and writing flowing out. Based on this model, educators commonly act as though speaking and writing are alike (writing is simply speech on paper) and reading and listening are alike (one uses ears as the receptacle and one uses eyes). Also implied is that the more 'elementary' modes of communication, after mastery, should give way to higher order communicating, namely reading and writing. Speaking and listening are fine for grammar school, but by junior high school, students should receive their preponderance of instruction and learning through print.

By sixth grade, the effects of this model on educational practices are considerable. The materials and the instructional techniques teachers use are often predicated on the beliefs that a) reading about a topic is the

same or better than hearing about that topic, b) if students can decode print they can comprehend it, c) if they can speak, they can write. The intent of this paper is to submit a different metaphor for the language arts, to focus on the relationships between reading and listening and to provide suggestions for classroom practices. While leaving others to debate issues b and c, this paper will address the following questions:

I. What does recent research tell us about similarities and differences between reading and listening?

II. What does recent research tell us about current classroom practices in listening at the junior high school level?

III. Do teachers consciously and systematically provide a bridge between informal, everyday oral language and formal, textbook language?

## The Metaphor: Relationships between Reading and Listening

He who talks to himself is creative;
he who answers himself is crazy.

Anonymous

A genre of jokes exists about persons talking to themselves with a punch line referring to their sanity or insanity based on whether they answer themselves. I am simultaneously amused and bemused since I intend to argue that reading and listening are similar processes in requiring persons to "talk-back-to-themselves," whereas speaking and writing differ from reading and listening in that they require persons to talk-to-someone-else.

The works of Louise Rosenblatt, Kenneth Goodman, Frank Smith, and others have provided us with a view of reading that supports this idea of

talking-to-oneself and attacks the linear view of reading. Using differing vocabulary to describe reading, they nonetheless all argue that reading, if comprehension is to occur, is an interactive, hypothesis testing process that requires a kind of internal dialogue between the reader and the text. For instance, all of us who are avid fiction readers can remember instances of "talking back" to a book we are reading or asking ourselves if we would have acted as a certain character. In fact, many of us maintain that without such a dialogue between reader and text only a facsimile of reading actually takes place--word calling, at best. At this juncture, I would like to propose that one of the similarities between reading and listening is they both require this internal dialogue and, consequently are "hypothesis testing" operations. Brian Cambourne (1981) describes listening comprehension as "not entirely an 'outside-in' process."

...that listeners make an active contribution to what they

> hear, and that this ability to understand speech depends, to a large extent, on the ability to understand meanings first of all, rather than vice versa. In other words, in the act of comprehension of spoken discourse there is a major "inside-out" flow of information; listeners bring to bear this knowledge of the regularities of their language (i.e., syntax) and their background conceptual knowledge of the topic of discourse. In this way they build up a set of expectations of what is going to be said next by their interlocutors before it is actually said. The speech sounds that follow are merely sampled in order to either confirm or reject these expectations. ...against what is actually said.

Cambourne quotes Frank Smith as saying, "The more you already know, the less closely you have to listen, but the more you will hear." (p. 94) Furthermore, David Pearson states "Reading is relating the new to the known" (Pearson, p. 47, 1978). These two statements summarize the major similarities, then, between reading and listening processes. Both depend to some degree on prior knowledge, shared experience, and common language meanings.*

Both require active talking-to-oneself, both depend on the ability of the individual to evaluate correct or incorrect responses.

Another similarity between listening and reading is that either success or failure to comprehend is often known only by the receiver of the information. Unlike speakers and writers who receive feedback from an audience, listeners and readers can feign understanding, attention, and interest. Unless a teacher gives an assessment measure, a listener/reader must rely on him/herself.

But, what might seem an advantage to readers and listeners--no outside arbiter to judge them--can serve as a crippling disadvantage. James Collins concludes,

> In spoken dialogue meaning is the creation of more than one person;....Meaning is established through cooperation and collaboration. And just as speakers share the construction of meaning, they can also share features of the linguistic environment that supports and contributes to meaning: gestures, facial expressions, pitch, intonation, and contexts of situation and culture. (Collins, 1981)

That is, speakers can rely on immediate feedback from other participants in a discussion, and writers can hope that readers will respond in some way to their message. Listeners and readers have only themselves as evaluators. For adolescents mistrusting their own judgments, reading and listening must be frustrating activities (Goodman; Smith, et al.). The concept of answering oneself is frightening when one doesn't trust the respondent and the response.

---

*The work of Basil Bernstein in England, though very controversial, is still useful in suggesting that differences in social class dialect and experience inhibit both oral and written comprehension. (Bernstein, B. Social class and linguistic development: A theory of social learning. In A.H. Halsey, J. Flood, and C.A. Anderson (eds.), Education, economy, and society. New York: Free Press, 1961.)

Although the processes of listening and reading appear remarkably alike, as products, written language and oral language are very different and therefore require different competencies from students. On a superficial level, reading requires visual acuity, knowledge of the appropriate visual symbols representing language, decoding skills; listening requires aural acuity and ability to attend. But, on a deeper level, each has advantages and constraints requiring specific, intentional instruction by educators as well as systematic experience in shifting from one communication mode to the other. For example, Bernstein (fn., p.4) argues that children unfamiliar with conventions of classroom language fail to comprehend teachers' oral instruction; children speaking a different social class dialect or a second language, are likely to misinterpret spoken words, subtle cues, body language and facial expressions, thereby missing meaning. And, unlike when reading a text, the student is unable to reread the passage, rely on certain kinds of context clues, use a dictionary, or take the information to be 'translated' by someone else at a later time. Once the words are spoken, unless additionally noted or taped, they are gone. (Lundsteen, p. 2, 1974)

Reading, too, has its unique demands. Most dramatically, reading is an abstract process; symbols represent 'natural language.' Reading probably requires more motivation from students since it is a secondary use of language; written language represents oral language. Listening, which is the basis for language development of hearing people, is something children have done since birth, is more often practiced, and is, therefore, easier than reading. James Britton is frequently quoted as saying: "Reading and writing float on a sea of talk."

What Role Does Listening Play in the Junior High School Classroom?

> ...where teachers failed they did so from imperception about how learning occurs, about the processes of making and interpreting symbols, the inner workings behind the talking, reading, and writing. (Moffett, p. vii, 1983)

Most language arts texts for elementary school teachers consider all the language arts and encourage teachers to address speaking, reading, writing and listening. However, with few exceptions listening skills are given the least emphasis. Much of this is due, I am certain, to the somewhat elusive quality of listening. Unlike speaking, writing, and to some degree reading, little physical evidence of listening can be observed. Listeners, even more than readers, can appear to pay alert attention and absorb nothing at all or look bored while soaking up every detail.

Consequently, teachers often overlook the necessity for oral language in the classroom and rely on reading as both sufficient and preferable to listening as a vehicle for learning; this seems more and more the practice the higher the grade level. By the junior high school years, teachers operate as though students have acquired all necessary listening skills, reading skills and speaking skills, and the most efficient way to teach content is by supplying students with a text. If teachers talk, it is to lecture on a topic not available in the text, to introduce the topic, to give directions, to answer and to ask questions. Student talk is usually directed toward similar tasks. The usually misnamed 'discussion' is often a teacher-directed question/answer session or lecture.

A number of studies report a dearth of oral language in many public school classrooms. Dolores Durkin (1978-79) found after observing for almost 300 hours that by third grade "when children are able to do some independent reading, teachers switch to assignment giving and interrogation." (p. 510). By junior high school, for a variety of reasons, this system of read the

assignment, complete the written activities, answer the test questions, is firmly entrenched as the dominant mode of 'instruction.'

Durkin's study, actually consisting of three sub-studies, was an ambitious attempt to observe and document both teacher and student behaviors in third through sixth grade reading, social studies, and science classes. Altogether she and two trained observers noted activities in 39 classrooms representing over a dozen school districts in central Illinois. Interested in whether or not reading comprehension was being taught and how, Durkin defined comprehension instruction as--"Teacher does/says something to help children understand or work out the meaning of more than a single isolated word (p. 488)." Some examples of such instruction are:

> calls children's attention to the meaning and importance of key words in written directions (e.g., each, if, all underline, match).
>
> helps children understand that certain words signal sequence (e.g., first, before, at the same time, later, meanwhile, ultimately).
>
> Using a sentence like The little kindergarten boy was crying, teacher asks children to name everything it tells about the boy.
>
> Using pairs of sentences, teacher has children compare their content to see whether it is the same. Pairs might be something like:
>
> Once home, she changed into her old clothes.
> She changed clothes after she got home.
>
> He was killed by the train at the crossing.
> It was at the crossing that the train killed him.

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

As can be seen from Table 1, less than one percent of the reading period was devoted to comprehension instruction and less than one-third on comprehension related activities. Durkin found that assessment, often in the form of workbooks and ditto sheets, was the dominant mode. The largest amount of teacher time was spent dealing with assignments. Furthermore,

Insert Table 2 about here

> All the observed teachers saw the social studies period as a time to cover content--as a time to have children "master the facts."
>
> Concurrently, no teacher saw the social studies period as a time to help with reading. Children who could not read the textbook were expected to learn the content from round robin reading of the text by better readers, and from films and filmstrips. (p. 502)

Particularly significant was Durkin's finding that less than 11% of social studies time was spent listening. Furthermore, most of that time was listening to films and other media devoted to course content rather than for helping students to develop problem-solving strategies for making sense of the content. Oral reading by the teacher or peers accounted for 7.75% of the total class time, not quite 8% was classified as discussion and approximately 5½% in oral review.

By and large sub-study 2 reflected the findings of the first sub-study. Durkin described one of the teachers as "an assignment giver, not an instructor." (p. 505) "...completing assignments and getting right answers seemed more significant than concerns like Do the children understand this?.... Waiting while a class worked on assignments was common...." (p. 506). Teacher manuals were rarely used except to identify vocabulary words suggested for study both prior to and concluding reading assignments

Sub-study 3 consisted of in-depth observations of three children grades 3, 5, and 6. Almost one-quarter of the total time of the sixth grader was spent listening but less than 3% of that listening time was directed toward comprehension or study skills improvement; for these three students purposeful listening occurred even less in social studies and science classes than in reading.

Durkin's data are depressing especially when one considers that secondary school teachers, including those in junior high schools, are more likely to rely on students 'reading to learn' strategies even more than elementary school teachers. In most cases the experiences of sixth graders are not likely to be substantially different from eighth graders. Admittedly not every teacher can be judged by the majority. However, we cannot overlook Durkin's conclusions that:

> The heavy reliance on workbooks and ditto sheets forces consideration of the possibility that "Do what is easy" is a significant source of influence. ...some... were conscientious professionals who...think that is the way to conduct school. Ask such teachers what they do and they would say "Instruct." (p. 525)

Work published since Durkin's study has verified her conclusions. For instance, David Dillon and Dennis Searle (1981) summarized their study of first graders:

> ...the language use required of pupils in the classroom was very limited in quantity and purpose and that classroom language use was dominated by teacher talk, largely for explaining and evaluating.

Finally, in a study of secondary schools students in New Zealand, Tom Nicholson (1983) looked at secondary reading comprehension instruction focusing on the students' tasks and needs. Three of the questions he asked were:

1. What kinds of reading tasks are assigned to secondary students in science, English, mathematics and social studies?
2. What kinds of knowledge are required for students to be able to complete these tasks?
3. What kinds of strategies do students use in order to cope with these reading tasks?

Altogether, Nicholson collected some 18,000 minutes of classroom observation, and over 400 minutes of tape-recorded conversations with students. He, like others, found students often ill-prepared to benefit from reading texts in the content areas and that a frequent alternative chosen by teachers was to

read the material aloud to the class rather than to instruct the students in ways of comprehending the text. Nicholson identified four categories of difficulty among secondary school readers:

1. students' theories; 2. text connections; 3. maps and diagrams;

4. Everyday versus instructional talk;.

Nicholson's findings concerning students' theories conform to previous research. He found students' success in comprehending text was tied to their previous knowledge, experience, and expectations.The same can be said for text connections; students familiar with a topic were able to follow the logic, shifts in perspective and links in the reading material. Conversely, students unacquainted with the material overlooked or were confused by transitional cues such as 'because,' 'in other words,' etc.

As might be predicted, students tried to read graphs, maps, diagrams and charts like connected prose and, as a result, were often unable to make much sense of the information.

For the purposes of this paper, I was most interested in Nicholson's finding concerning everyday versus instructional talk; that is, whether teachers use oral-everyday-language to mediate oral-instructional- language to link to written-instructional-language or, whether like in the Dillon and Durkin studies, teachers 'mention' rather than 'translate' new vocabulary, concepts, and clues to understanding texts and literature.

Nicholson concluded his study by reporting:

> We thought, at first, that many of the confusions which occurred were due to 'decoding' or because pupils did not 'read' the text information.
>
> ...we concluded that the 'errors' were not the problem. They only reflected pupils' prior knowledge of the content areas and their strategies for reading in those content areas...and sometimes to a mismatch between pupils' and teachers' schema.
> (p. 21).

Two Teachers Talking

I was particularly concerned with whether or not experienced teachers used everyday-oral-language to explain instructional- and/or literary-language to enhance students' reading proficiency. I was curious if junior high school teachers were significantly different from the teachers in Durkin's study in their patterns of teaching comprehension and frequency of oral language instruction. Finally, I wanted to learn if the teachers in my study utilized the teacher manuals any differently from those reported earlier.

Though both informal and limited in scope, my study reinforced previous research: 1) proportionally little oral language instruction took place in the classrooms observed and, 2) like Durkin's subjects, teachers I interviewed used teacher guides primarily as sources for vocabulary lessons attached to the reading assignment.

The Study

After struggling with scheduling difficulties, teachers' reluctance to be systematically observed, a week of standardized achievement tests, a week devoted to 'cultural awareness activities, a week of events marking the end of the school year, random assemblies, films, power failures, influenza epidemics and the other variables that make classrooms unpredictable, I concentrated on interviews (Table 3) with two teachers using random observations to validate their interview responses. Following are my findings.

---

Insert Table 3 about here

The School

The junior high school in which the two teachers teach is racially and economically integrated through an active district busing plan. Located in a predominantly Mexican-American community, the school has a positive image, a closely-knit group of teachers and cooperative administrators. The curricula is divided into English classes and reading classes with the former to emphasize grammar, composition and literature--in that order. These classes are homogeneously grouped into high, average, and low according to standardized test scores.

Reading classes are similarly grouped. Exceptional students are placed in either remedial reading classes or, at the upper levels, excused from reading class. The purpose of the reading class is to encourage students' reading skills and reading across content areas. In practice, for the average classes, reading looks very much like the English classes without the concentration on grammar. Both programs include fiction and non-fiction, have anthologies available, though with different selections and different kinds of suggested activities, and both usually include some student writing. Whereas, the English classes may have a preponderance of grammar worksheets, the reading classes have reading skills exercises.

In both courses, teachers have considerable leeway in opting for certain curriculum materials, instructional techniques and evaluation practices.

The Teachers

The two teachers interviewed for this study were chosen for sharing a number of characteristics. Both teachers are women in their late twenties/early thirties, are Anglo, speak and write standard English. Also, they both had similar undergraduate backgrounds. One, who now teaches eighth grade English, received a bachelor of arts degree in English and history from the University of Texas at Austin. The other, who teaches seventh grade reading earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Education with majors in English and social studies from the same university. 'Ms. Eighth' has been teaching seven years and 'Ms. Seventh', nine years. Their major difference in professional preparation is that Ms. Seventh has a master of science in education with specialization in reading. The analysis of their interview responses will reflect this difference.

Finally, both teachers work with student teachers and have been identified by both district supervisors and university coordinators as outstanding role models. As such they conduct themselves professionally, maintain a connection with the university community, participate in regularly scheduled in-service workshops and are open to new ideas. Unfortunately, neither teacher is active in a national professional organization or current graduate coursework so she is not aware on a systematic basis of current research or practice.

In summary, both teachers were selected because they are admired by their students and colleagues as effective, excellent educators.

Results of the Interview

As was mentioned, one of the most dramatic findings was that both teachers used teachers' guides largely for identifying vocabulary words associated with a reading selection. Ms. Seventh sometimes culled ideas from

guides for introducing and explaining individual stories. In some cases, according to Ms. Eighth, teacher guides were not available; both teachers organized their classes more or less on themes using material from a variety of sources. They both said they choose materials and selections according to: students' reading levels; interests, time constraints, available materials, personal interests, timely topics. As a result, no single text or anthology was used exclusively or exhaustively. For example, during my observation, Ms. Eighth was teaching The Diary of Anne Frank after interest had been generated from The Winds of War television mini-series. In addition, students were viewing The Outsiders prior to reading it as a class novel.

Both teachers had the students read textbook introductory sections as preparation for reading the work itself. In addition to reading this prepared material, each teacher provided oral comments; my observations and their estimates of spending 10 to 15 minutes discussion on each reading selection would support Durkin's contention that teachers mention rather than elaborate a topic or concept to be learned by students.

Whereas the reading teacher usually has the students complete the activities following the reading selection the English teacher does not. This difference, I am certain, has to do with the nature and expectations of each course. Whereas the English teacher states "The questions in the book don't necessarily get students to think about the questions I want them to," the reading teacher views her responsibility as getting students to use what they have read.

Background in the teaching of reading also accounts for a difference in other regular procedures for introducing a story. Ms. Seventh, the reading teacher, routinely begins each new reading selection with SQ3R

previewing techniques. She then gives an oral, brief synopsis of the selection and conducts a class discussion (10 minutes) on events in students' lives relating to the chosen story. She then introduces five vocabulary words taken from the teacher guide, puts them on an overhead projector and assigns students to define the words according to their text glossary. The class then reads the story out loud together and finally responds to the textbook questions/activities at the end. Ms. Eighth, on the other hand, more commonly alerts her students to look for literary conventions (significance of the title, foreshadowing, etc.) and relies on personally prepared study guides.

Because of grouping policies in the district neither teacher was concerned with accommodating different ability levels in the same class.

Significantly both teachers explain student comprehension difficulties similarly. Neither attribute reading problems to a lack of skills but to a lack of motivation, lack of interest, bad habits, limited ability, little interest in responding, concern with personal problems, preferences, and/or non-school interests. Ms. Seventh argued: "They don't need more skills; they need more reading."

But nowhere did either teacher say students need more listening or speaking practice. I agree with Ms. Seventh that junior high school students need to read not to learn about reading, but perhaps both motivational problems and problem-solving skills (text attack skills, if you prefer) would benefit from the kinds of instruction suggested by Durkin not to mention the negotiation of language emphasized by Nicholson--everyday-language to instructional-language to textbook-language.

When asked about the role of oral discussion and instruction and purposeful listening activities both teachers expressed concern about

maintaining students' attention; they felt more effective when students were 'actively' engaged in tangible activity. Not surprisingly, the majority of oral language was oral reading, teacher 'mentioning' or teacher directed question and answer 'discussions.'

In no way is this analysis meant to place the burden of blame on either teacher; these individuals showed concern and commitment to students and teaching. Their dilemma is best described by Durkin's comments that:

> ...conscientious teachers may have done what they did because they think that is what is expected of them. ...the quality of an instructional program is directly related to the number of completed assignment sheets cannot be overlooked. After all, isn't this evidence of "back to basics"? (p. 525)

Recommendations for Practice

1. We must convince educators of all grade and ability levels that students never outgrow a need for instruction in negotiating written language. Simplifying content area texts according to sophisticated readability formulas is not the solution. Current research should serve as a convincing argument that oral language needs to be given a significant increase in schools.

2. We must consciously and systematically plan listening opportunities for both students and teachers in secondary school classrooms. That is, teachers must prepare lessons having the distinct purpose of translating, not simply mentioning, concepts so students can negotiate written language from the oral mode to the written and back again.

3. Classrooms need to be organized differently to encourage authentic discussions not only teacher orchestrated talk. For this to occur oral language needs to be elevated to a necessary part of the curricula.

4. Teacher training needs overhauling. The teachers in my study could not recall having been taught the importance of oral language and they are language arts teachers! Neither one recollected a great deal of emphasis at pre-service, in-service, or graduate level courses on the importance of oral language and listening to total language development. Both were certain they had never had a course, text, or portions of either devoted to practical listening activities for the secondary student.

5. Content area teachers as well as language arts teachers need to become more aware of language functions and language 'registers.'

6. School administrators, curriculum supervisors, and educational officials need to recognize that visible products and student activity are not the only or even best measures of growth and learning. Worksheets and exercises transfer less well into the real world than do competent listening abilities.

7. The whole concept of schooling needs to be modified. Teachers mention; call attention to, or pay heed to rather than discuss, explore, and explain because they do not have time--time to meet everyone's demands, needs, deadlines, and goals. Presently, teachers who use the ditto sheet, product-oriented method of teaching the language arts are most often rewarded with parental confidence, administrative support, quiet, well-mannered classrooms. Somehow, this reward system must be redistributed to favor teachers recognizing process in addition to product.

None of these suggestions is easy to operationalize. In fact, more than one is probably impossible if not revolutionary. Those of us working in teacher training know how difficult it will be to convince math teachers they need to know variations of language registers, casual speech and textbook

language. As difficult will be to convince the secondary school English teacher that books do not deserve three quarters of classroom time.

But if schools are to be places for students to learn to negotiate meaning; if we want to provide the means for our students to succeed, and if we see the role of teachers as that of mediator, we must begin to try.

Table 1 Percentage of teacher time spent on comprehension and study skills during the reading period

| Behavioral Categories | Percentage of 4,469 Minutes |
|---|---|
| Comprehension: instruction | 0.63 |
| Comprehension: review of instruction | N.O. |
| Comprehension: application | N.O. |
| Comprehension: assignment | 2.13 |
| Comprehension: help with assignment | 5.46 |
| Comprehension: preparation for reading | 5.53 |
| Comprehension: assessment | 17.65 |
| Comprehension: prediction | 0.25 |
| Study skills: instruction | N.O. |
| Study skills: review of instruction | N.O. |
| Study skills: application | 0.43 |
| Study skills: assignment | 0.16 |
| | 32.24 |

Table 2 Percentage of teacher time spent during the reading period on activities connected with assignments

| Behavioral Categories | Percentage of 4,469 Minutes |
|---|---|
| Comprehension: assignment | 2.13 |
| Comprehension: help with assignment | 5.46 |
| Comprehension: assessment | 17.65 |
| Study skills: assignment | 0.16 |
| Assignment: gives | 4.72 |
| Assignment: helps with | 6.94 |
| Assignment: checks | 2.69 |
| | 39.75 |

Table 3

Name: School: Grade:
Subject: No. Years Experience: Degrees:
Major: Minor:

1. Please list all materials available to you for teaching literature (title, publisher, date)

2. How do you choose materials for teaching literature?

3. Are teacher's guides available?

4. Do you use them? To what extent?

5. Do you have students read the introductory passages before a literary selection?

6. Do you have students answer textbook questions/activities following their reading of a literary selection?

7. Do you follow any other regular procedures for introducing a literary selection to the class?

8. Do you prepare your own study guides? If so, would you please attach some examples.

9. Do your students read on/below/above grade level? In what proportion?

10. How do you accommodate different reading levels in your class when reading a literary selection?

11. How much discussion (approximate minute) would you say you have for each reading selection?

12. To what do you attribute students' difficulties in reading and comprehending fiction? How do you adjust for their difficulties?

13. At the junior high school level, what do you think is most important for students to learn from/about literature?

14. What do you enjoy teaching most in junior high school language arts?

15. Draw a pie describing the proportion of time you spend on different parts of the language arts program each semester.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brause, R. S., & Mayher, J. S. Teachers, students, and classroom organizations. Research in the Teaching of English, 1982, 16(2), 131-148.

Britton, J. Language and learning. New York: Penguin Books, 1970.

Cambourne, B. Oral and written relationships: A reading perspective. In B. M. Kroll & R. J. Vann (Eds.), Exploring speaking-writing relationships. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1981.

Collins, J. L. Speaking, writing, and teaching for meaning. In B. M. Kroll & R. J. Vann (Eds.,), Exploring speaking-writing relationships. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1981.

Dillon, D., & Searle, D. The role of language in one first grade classroom. Research in the Teaching of English, 1981, 15(4), 311-328.

Durkin, D. What classroom observations reveal about reading comprehension instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, 1978-1979, XIV(4), 481-531.

Fagan, E. R., Hassler, D. M., & Szabo, M. Evaluation of questioning strategies in language arts instruction. Research in the Teaching of English, 1981, 15(3), 267-273.

Kantor, K. J., & Rubin, D. L. Between speaking and writing: Processes of differentiation. In B. M. Kroll & R. J. Vann (Eds.), Exploring speaking-writing relationships. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1981.

Loban, W. Language development: Kindergarten through grade twelve. NCTE

Research Report No. 18. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1976.

Lundsteen, S. W. Listening: Its impact at all levels on reading and the other language arts (Rev. ed.). Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1979.

Moffett, J. Teaching the universe of discourse. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1983.

Nicholson, T. "You get lost when you gotta blimmin watch the damn words.": Reading and learning in the junior secondary school classroom. Pre-publication paper. Austin, Texas: Centre for Cognitive Science, University of Texas at Austin, 1983.

Pearson, P. D., & Johnson, D. D. Teaching reading comprehension. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978.

Schafer, J. C. The linguistic analysis of spoken and written texts. In B. M. Kroll & R. J. Vann (Eds.), Exploring speaking-writing relationships. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1981.